Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP78-06362 4000200010006-7

DRAFT

21 July 1971

Dear Red:

I came away from the Deputies' meeting with a sense of profound discouragement over the real meaning of the discussion that took place. The real subject
was not the National Interdepartmental Seminar, it was the importance of training.
And not a man in the room said a single word in recognition of that importance.

The way one man after another commented mostly on the difficulty (or lack of
intention) of finding people to send to a course emphasized more clearly than I have
ever heard it before that training is a not very tolerable obstacle to getting the job
done. When Tom K. said "On top of all this you're now asking us to send a lot of topgrade people to your Senior Seminar," he cast it as an accusation, not as a challenging
opportunity to help people do their jobs better.

Nobody had the slightest interest in my point that three weeks in the NIS had been shown to be valuable to a lot of people all over the outfit. What little grudging acceptance the point got showed both skepticism and a lack of interest in finding out whether the course might be valuable after all. If anybody were interested, he would have been willing to look at critiques from his own people, and ask questions about the content and conduct of the course. Simple assertions that the course used to be more relevant than it is now are very ill informed.

What bugs everybody most is the amount of manpower required. But if they were

Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP78-06362A000200010006-7

Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP78-06362A000200010006-7

interested in training when it's good, and in the opportunity to cross-fertilize the rest of the community, they could find two or three times as many people as the quota we allowed ourselves to accept years ago (when the course was five weeks). The best proof of this is the rush to get into the external courses that last many times as long. If CIA sent eight people to each of six/three-week runnings, the total cost in manpower would be 144 man-weeks, or less than three man-years divided among 48 people. By contrast, the nominations for the senior external courses for 1972 add up to a certification that the Agency can spare senior manpower for 37.8 man-years. Since each nomination is a sign that the nominee can be spared for up to ten or eleven months, the whole list works out like this:

(See Attached Tables)

all the additional management programs, Brookings seminars, etc., plus thirty-odd people off on full-time academic training at any given time, and it becomes clear that people can be made available when their superiors are interested.

The question arises why it is so easy to spare a man for the courses listed above and so hard to send people to the short NIS course or some of the good courses given by OTR. I am coming to conclude that the directorates want their subordinates to be selected for the prestige involved and not for what they learn. Nobody ever questions the value of the war colleges; people assume that value without noticing that month after month of the courses has next to nothing to do with the functions of CIA. Why do they assume the lack of value of three weeks in the NIS, every bit of it spent either learning from or contributing to discussions of matters that profoundly concern the functions of CIA? The war colleges have a reputation for prestige and glamor (highly inflated in my opinion), and the NIS has none. It's as simple as that. For myself, I continue to believe that many people from the Agency have found the NIS personally valuable, as they have attested in a thick file of laudatory critiques, and I am especially sure that the NIS is an excellent forum for CIA representatives to educate the rest of the community.

Approved For Release 2002/05/01: CIA-RDP78-063624000200010006-7

Nominees for Senior Schools 1972-73 Directorate of Intelligence

	School/Program	Grade/Nominees	Total Weeks
	Air War College - 42 weeks	GS-14 - 2	84
	Armed Forces Staff College - 21 weeks	GS-13 - 6 GS-12 - 1	147
	Army War College - 44 weeks	GS-14 - 2	88
•	Industrial College of the Armed Forces 42 weeks	- GS-15 - 1	42
	National War College - 43 weeks	GS-15 - 2	86
	Naval War College - 44 weeks	GS-14 - 2	88
5X6	50 weeks	GS-15 - 2	100
	Senior Seminar in Foreign Policy - 43 weeks	GS-16 - 1 GS-15 - 1	86
	Totals	20	721
			14 years

25

Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP78-06362A000200010006-7

Nominees for Senior Schools 1972-73 Clandestine Service

School/Program	Grade/Nominees	Total Weeks
Advanced Management Program, Harvard 13 weeks	GS-16 - 1	13
Air War College - 42 weeks	GS-14 - 2	84
Armed Forces Staff College - 21 weeks	GS-13 - 2	42
Army War College - 44 weeks	GS-14 - 1	44
National War College - 43 weeks	GS-15 - 3	129
Naval War College - 44 weeks	GS-14 - 1	44
Program for Management Development, Harvard - 14 weeks	GS-15 - 1	14
Senior Seminar in Foreign Policy - 43 weeks	GS-16 - 3	129
	AND Directoring Land	
Totals	14	499
		9-3/5 years

Approved For elease 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP78-063624900200010006-7

Nominees for Senior Schools 1972-73 Support Services

School/Program	Grade/Nominees	Total Weeks
Advanced Management Program, Harvard - 13 weeks	GS-16 - 1	13
Air War College - 42 weeks	GS-14 - 1	42
Armed Forces Staff College - 21 weeks	GS-14 - 1 GS-13 - 7	168
Army War College - 44 weeks	GS-14 - 2	88
Industrial College of the Armed Forces - 42 weeks	GS-15 - 1	42
National War College - 43 weeks	GS-15 - 2	86
Naval War College - 44 weeks	GS-14 - 3	132
Program for Management Development, Harvard - 14 weeks	GS-14 - 3 GS-13 - 1	56
Totals	22	627
		12 years

Approved For Release 2002/05/01 : CIA-RDP78-063624000200010006-7

Nominees for Senior Schools 1972-73

Directorate of Science & Technology

School/Program	Grade/Nominees	Total Weeks
Industrial College of the Armed Forces - 42 weeks	GS-15 - 1	42
National War College - 43 weeks	GS-15 - 1	43
Program for Management Development, Harvard - 14 weeks	GS-15 - 1 GS-13 - 1	28

Totals	4	113
		2 - 1/5 years